

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 remain in this application. Claims 1, 16 and 17 have been canceled. Claims 2-6, 11, 13 and 15 have been amended.

Claim 8 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 11, 13 and 15 have been amended to depend upon independent claim 10.

Claims 1-4 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(a) as being anticipated by Gray in U.S. Patent No. 2,315,516. This rejection is respectfully overcome as Claims 8, 9 and 10 were objected to by the examiner as “-- *being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims*” and as amended claims 8, 9 and 10 now contain all of the limitations of claim 1. Claims 2- 4, and 13-15 depend upon Claim 10 and as such are no longer subject to the rejection. Claim 16 has been canceled no longer claiming matter which formed the basis for the examiners rejection.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(a) as being anticipated by Brueske in U.S. Patent No. 3,880,405. This rejection is respectfully overcome as Claims 8, 9 and 10 were objected to by the examiner as “-- *being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims*” and as amended claims 8, 9 and 10 now contain all of the limitations of claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 11 depend upon Claim 1 and as such are no longer subject to the rejection. Claim 17 has been canceled no longer claiming matter which formed the basis for the examiners rejection.

Claims 1-5, 11, 12, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(a) as being anticipated by Hawks, Jr. in U.S. Patent No. 6,279,880 This rejection is respectfully overcome as Claims 8, 9 and 10 were objected to by the examiner as “-- *being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims*” and as amended claims 8, 9 and 10 now contain all of the limitations of claim 1. Claims 2-5, 11, and 12 depend upon Claim 1 and as such are no longer subject to the rejection. Claim 16 and 17 have been canceled no longer claiming matter which formed the basis for the examiners rejection.

Claims 8, 9 and 10 were objected to by the examiner as “-- *being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims*”. Claims 8-10 have been amended to overcome the objection by being rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of claim 1, as suggested by the examiner and is therefore are all now in condition of allowance.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are deemed overcome by applicants amendment and remarks. Claims 8 and 9 are independent and allowable as amended and claims 2-6, 11, 13 and 15 now depend upon allowable amended claim 10. Claims 7, 12 and 14 have not been amended as they depend upon claims 6, 11 and 13 respectively.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

No additional fee is deemed necessary at this time.

Respectfully Submitted,



**Albert O. Cota**

Patent Agent  
Reg. No. 29,291

Phone: (818) 368-4332  
Fax: (818) 368-4332  
e-mail: [patentlawinc@hotmail.com](mailto:patentlawinc@hotmail.com)